

SILVER PLUME MINING COMPANY.

PERSECUTION AGAINST THE COMPANY

AND

JUSTIFICATION.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL moved the adoption of the report of the Select Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills on Bill (85) "An Act to incorporate the Silver Plume Mining Company." He said: It is somewhat unusual for a Committee on Private Bills to present a report of this kind; it would be well, perhaps, to give the substance of it. The Committee reports with reference to this Bill that the preamble has not been proved to their satisfaction; the balance of the evidence given before them being, in their opinion, contrary to its statements; and that it was proved to the Committee that an action at the suit of the Crown against the petitioners for this Bill for acting illegally as a corporation, under the name of the "Silver Plume Mining Company," is pending in the Superior Court at Montreal, which action might be affected by the passing of this Bill. It is scarcely necessary for me to say more than that the Committee took a great deal of pains to ascertain the true character of this Bill before agreeing to this report. They heard the parties on both sides—the promoters of the Bill, and the petitioners against it.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE—I regret that I have to protest against this report. I waited until I would see the report and ascertain the wording of it, and had the wording been different from what it is, I would have submitted to it.

but as it now stands I cannot do so. This report is not according to the facts, and it is my duty to say that this hon. House ought not to accept it because it does not relate the facts as they are. It states "That the preamble of the Bill has not been proved to the satisfaction of the Committee, the balance of the evidence given before them being, in their opinion, contrary to its statements." I may say that no evidence at all has been heard; on the contrary, the fact is that a gentleman from Montreal having appeared before the Committee to oppose the Bill, and he having made a serious charge against some of the petitioners, the latter at once offered to furnish all necessary evidence, if the Committee would postpone the consideration of the Bill until the following day. When it is known that the parties asking for incorporation are such men as P. A. A. Dorion, Theod. Doucet, Jos. Oct. Charlebois, Adolphe Masson, etc., hon. gentlemen will no doubt regret that such a report has been laid before them for adoption. And when this hon. House is now asked to concur in the said report, am I not in duty bound to call the attention of hon. members to the facts, and show them that the report is false?

Hon. Gentlemen—Order! Order.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—I withdraw the expression "false," but I repeat that the report is quite contrary to the facts; let hon. gentlemen call it what they like, it matters very little. No hon. member who sat on the committee can deny that the statements I make here are the facts. I do not say that the proof offered would have been sufficient. But what I do say is, that if the Committee had allowed the Bill to stand until the following day, they would have shown how they understood British fair play. But the Committee obstinately refused to do so. The second reason given in the report of the Committee is, because there is a suit pending, and it was stated that something wrong had been done, that some outside parties had been cheated. I do not deny that that may be true, but the Committee had no evidence, adduced before

it, that such was the case, except a document signed by the prothonotaries of the Superior Court sitting in Montreal, showing that there was before that Court the case of the Attorney General of Quebec, against P. A. A. Dorion *et al.* Now to put such a statement in the public documents of this House, as the second clause of this report, is a thing that I cannot stand here and approve of. Suppose the allegations are true; and suppose there is a case in the Superior Court, at Montreal, between the contesting parties. I ask how this Bill could influence that case when it is provided, and it has been at the instance of the parties who are suing in the Superior Court at Montreal, and who are here opposing the charter asked for, that the parties would not suffer by this act of incorporation, as their rights were reserved. But here, again, has not the Committee shown some preference, to say the least, for the opponents of the Bill? If they honestly desired that no action of theirs might affect the pending case in Montreal, how is it that they have added to their report such a paragraph as the second, which evidently might prejudice the Court against the petitioners for incorporation, who are the defendants in the above mentioned suit. I am not surprised that the hon. chairman of the Committee began his remarks by stating it was rather an unusual report for the Committee to make. It is unusual; I have not seen the like of it during my whole parliamentary life, and it is the first time that I have been forced to say a report was contrary to the facts. The remedy would be to move that the report be not received, or that it be referred back to the Committee; but I suppose the House will stand by the Committee, and that the parties seeking incorporation, as well as myself, must submit to our fate. At all events, my protest will be recorded, and if the House shows a disposition to deal with this question according to its merits, I will be ready to move in the direction suggested.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL.—I think the hon. gentleman has made

a great mistake in saying that this House would not rectify a wrong which was clearly made known to it, even if it were done by one of its Committees. I am persuaded that if this House was satisfied that one of its Committees through error of judgment, or wilfully made a report not consistent with facts, it would be dealt with in such a way as to show that the Senate would not sanction such injustice. I differ entirely from the hon. gentleman who charges that this report from the Private Bills Committee is not consistent with the facts. It is a very serious charge to make. Can any hon. gentleman suppose that any motive will influence a Committee of this House to make a report that could be shown to be untrue? The hon. gentleman does not even modify his statement by allowing that there might have been a misrepresentation of the facts or a mistake in judgment, but he makes the direct and unmistakable charge that the Committee has knowingly made a false report, a charge that should not be made against any committee of this House. Are not the members of this Committee known to be gentlemen of character—gentlemen who would not stoop to a dishonorable act of this kind? I can assure the House that the Committee examined into this matter most patiently and impartially, and there was no disposition to do a wrong to any parties connected with the Bill. They did not take evidence on oath, but I contend they took sufficient evidence to guide them in their disposal of this matter. They heard at great length the parties promoting this Bill, and they heard at equal length the parties who contended that this Bill should not be granted by Parliament, and who showed by reasons satisfactory to the Committee that the Bill should not receive its sanction. It is unnecessary to go into the details of evidence that led the Committee to make this report, and I think hon. gentlemen will sustain my motion to adopt it when I say that it is strictly in accordance with the sentiments of the majority of the Committee, as expressed by the vote that

was taken. The Committee did not consider it necessary to mention any other fact than that a case was before the Superior Court of Montreal, an action against the promoters of this Bill, not for stealing or robbing individuals of any sums of money, but for the plain and open charge of fraud in connection with every step that has been taken by the accused in this matter, and the objectors to the Bill made their case so plain that they satisfied the Committee that this was not a Bill that could be recommended for adoption by this House.

Hon. Mr. MILLAR—I am not a member of the Private Bills Committee, and I am not, perhaps, sufficiently conversant with the facts of this case to enable me to speak with any confidence with regard to it; but I cannot agree with the Chairman of that Committee in some of the positions he has taken. In the first place, I think the report itself is somewhat extraordinary. I think it would have been sufficient to have reported that the preamble of the Bill is not proved, as set forth in the first clause of the report.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL—I consulted authorities in this matter, and it was found that while in the House of Lords it was the practice to report the preamble not proved without assigning any reason, by the rules of the Canadian Parliament the Committee must assign a reason.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—Then I am to understand that the only reason assigned for reporting the preamble not proved is that there is litigation pending?

Hon. Mr. VIDAL—No; that the evidence was not sufficient to prove the preamble.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—If the practice be as my hon. friend says, it must then be that the preamble was not proved because of the reasons contained in the second clause of the report. He is precluded by his own contention from going behind what is contained in the second clause of the report. At any rate, I think it is rather a serious matter to place this report on the journals of the House and adopt it in the way it now stands, because it is calcula-

ted, perhaps very unjustly, to do an injury to the parties who are interested. I will suppose a case. I will suppose that litigation has been commenced purposely to prevent the parties entitled to an act of incorporation from getting it. Should the existence of such litigation have that effect? I do not think it should; and if there was any doubt as to *bona fide* litigation existing with reference to the subject of this Act of Incorporation, there would be no difficulty in providing that it should not affect those suits. If I had been a member of the Committee, it is the course I would have recommended; but I do not think the bare fact of litigation pending ought to be sufficient to justify the rejection of the Bill, because that litigation may be frivolous and vexatious. The Private Bills Committee does not sit as a court to take evidence in such cases under oath, and consequently they might very easily be led astray. I do not take any interest in the question, but it strikes me that the report should not be let go as it is.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL.—I do not see that the language of the report can do any injustice to the parties engaged in the litigation; it only says that the litigation is pending, and that it might possibly be affected by the passing of the Bill. It cannot, I think, prejudice the parties to the litigation. But this is not the only reason given. The Committee say that the preamble is not proved, and the Chairman is right in saying that the rules of the House require them to state the reason of it. It seems to me that they have done their duty, according to the rule of the House, and that their report should be sustained.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE—I am happy to have heard the Chairman of the Committee take the position he has taken, because he has furnished this hon. House the best proof that my statements were true. The hon. gentleman has not been able to establish that any good evidence had been given before the Committee to justify the course adopted by them. I challenge any gentleman to

show that there was anything in the shape of evidence given before the Committee; therefore I say it ought not to be stated in the report that the preamble was not proved by the evidence given. If the suit now pending can be interfered with by the Act of Incorporation, this report, which is a public report of the Senate, if adopted, may more injuriously affect the defendants in the suit than Act of Incorporation, if it had been granted, could have injuriously affected the other party; because the bill provides that the Act of Incorporation shall not interfere with the lawsuit. I would ask that this report be not adopted, or, in case this House should come to the conclusion that they ought not to refuse their concurrence, that it be amended, at all events, by striking out the second part of it. Hon. gentlemen will see that I am ready to meet my fate, and this House ought not to do anything that would interfere with the rights of the promoters of the Bill.

Hon. MR. TRUDEL—I had occasion, as a member of the Committee, to vote for the motion of the hon. member for De Lanaudiere, to postpone the matter until next day, but unfortunately another Committee was sitting at the same time, and I did not hear the whole discussion on this Bill; but what I understood, and what seems to me of great importance, is this: It has been told that frauds had been proved before the Committee. I consider it is a serious accusation, and, as I happen to know some of the parties interested in this Bill as men of the highest respectability, I consider such an accusation of a very serious character.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—There is nothing about that in this report.

Hon. MR. TRUDEL—But it has been spoken of, and it was freely circulated amongst the members of the Committee, and amongst the members of the House. It has even been stated here in the House that frauds have been proved, that a law suit was pending on account of very heavy frauds having been committed by members of this Company. I think it may seriously affect the parties.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMRBELL.—It was not stated that fraud had been proved, but that fraud had been asserted.

HON. MR. TRUDEL.—Hon. gentlemen will remember that this Bill was before the Private Bills Committee of the House of Commons. It was reported to the House of Commons without any objection, and passed, and everybody knows that when a Bill comes from the other House before our Committee it does not happen once in ten cases that the parties are here, especially when they have no reason to suspect that such charges as this are likely to be brought against them before our Committee. I am told that the party who was heard before this Committee was the promoter of the suit in question that is against one of the members of this Company, who, as far as I am told, having sold stock to that gentleman, is accused of having made a fraudulent sale, by representing the stock of the Company as being of greater value than it is. There is litigation between these two men, and, at the last moment, one of them comes here and constitutes himself a witness against the other. The promoter of the Bill, not expecting that such evidence was to be offered, was not prepared for it, but he said, "Let the Bill stand until to-morrow, and I will telegraph to Montreal and have abundant evidence to prove to the contrary." This application was refused. I know some of the parties. I know the party who is said to have given his evidence against this Bill, and I know some of the men whose names are in the Bill, and I do not hesitate to say, knowing the character of those men, that, if anybody were to go to Montreal and say that Mr. So-and-so has been confronted with Mr. So-and-So, and that, on the evidence of Mr. So-and-so, the other party has been guilty of fraud, the party who would say so would be laughed at. There is no comparison between the standing of at least one gentleman whose name is in this Bill and some others. I have nothing to say against the character of any of them. I believe them all to be respectable men, but I know how parties are apt

to speak of each other when they are at law. There is another feature of the case : the Committee divided almost equally on the motion to postpone the consideration of the Bill until next day, to give the parties an opportunity to bring evidence, and all the members of the Committee from the Province where the parties lived, except one voted one way, that is, for the postponement, and all the other members voted the other way. The position taken towards these parties seeking this Act of Incorporation, especially when an accusation of fraud had been brought against them, and they were refused an opportunity to justify themselves, I think is rather arbitrary.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—Perhaps it would be very easy to get out of this difficulty in a way satisfactory to all parties. I think the first clause of the report fully meets all the requirements of the rules of the House. It says that the preamble of the Bill has not been proved to the satisfaction of the Committee, and the reason is given that the balance of evidence given before the Committee being, in their opinion, contrary to its statements. That is quite sufficient, and the balance of the report might be struck out, with the consent of the whole House, although not the most regular way of mending the matter. I am sure the hon. gentleman who is Chairman of the Committee has no object except to discharge the duties of his position properly, and if he would consent to strike out the second clause, and allow the report to stand in that way, it would, perhaps, meet the objection.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL—I thank the hon. gentleman for the suggestion, and, as far as I am concerned, I am willing that it be struck out if the House will consent to it.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD—The principal reason for objecting to this Bill was the evidence and statements made by the parties who were wishing to get this Act of Incorporation showing that the statement in the preamble was not correct, that is, that there was not a million of dollars paid up. It was not pretended that it was paid up. There-

fore it was that the resolution was adopted that the preamble is not proved.

Hon Mr BELLEROSE.—There is no use in trying to evade the question as it is. The matter stands as the Hon. member from DeSalaberry says—Mr. Lighthall against the other parties. Mr. Lighthall came there to oppose the Bill, and charged one of the petitioners, Mr. Dorion, with having cheated him, and spoke of the amount, and spoke about the million dollars. To that the petitioners, by their Solicitor, answered that if they were given twenty-four hours they would refute all the statements of Mr. Lighthall. A majority of the Committee refused, and made the report which is now before the House.

The report, as amended, was adopted.

THE SILVER PLUME MINING COMPANY.

To the Editor of the MONTREAL HERALD.

MR. EDITOR,—I count on the kindness you show daily to request the favour to insert in your valuable paper the history of the Silver Plume Mining Company, and acquaint the public with its actual standing.

The Company, or any of its officers, have never sold a single share to anyone in a speculative way, as certain newspapers and evil-disposed persons have spread abroad. The contrary has been proven in the Superior Court, as can be ascertained by examining the records.

The Company was organized in good faith under Articles 1859, 1865 and 1866 of the Civil Code of Lower Canada, which grant the right to anyone to put their property or capital in common to facilitate its workings. The organization was completed by act passed before a notary, as explained at a public meeting held at Montreal on the 7th day of June, 1880.

The property was acquired only after a thorough examination of the locality and experts' reports, made at our

request, of the value of the mine. These reports are at your disposal at any time. We have never asked anyone to join us without telling them all we knew of the value of the property, the way we were organized; and, furthermore, we have never given anyone to understand that we were incorporated. The few friends who joined our organization did so after being fully satisfied of the truth of our assertions, either by documents, or after visiting the mines personally.

In fact, everything possible was done to satisfy them of the truth of our representations before allowing them to join us in the working of the mine, in which we have the most implicit confidence. The Company has been sued as illegal for not being incorporated. This suit is as unjust as it is illegal. Notwithstanding the judgment rendered by His Honour Judge Torrance, for which opinion I have the highest respect, the Court of appeal will soon have occasion to reverse this judgment, we hope. It is a falsehood to say the mine only cost \$15,000, the price paid was \$115,000, of which \$100,000 was in stock and the balance in cash, and that after negotiating for at least three months. Furthermore, we have spent several thousand dollars in developing the mine. The most important point for the shareholder is to know how much the mine is worth. The report of Messrs. Sutherland, Willet, Allan McDonell, mining engineers and *experts*, and W. D. Sills, who went from this city to the mine, show that the mine is worth far more than the organization capital.

There is nothing astonishing, Mr. Editor, in those figures when it is considered that the Father de Smet, Deadwood and Homestake mines, which are only a short distance from ours, and which cost only a few thousand dollars about three years ago, are now all paying dividends on an incorporation of \$10,000,000 each. This is easily ascertained through the *New York Mining Record*. The ore in the above mines is far inferior to that taken from the Silver Plume, theirs averaging only \$8 per ton,

while the Silver plume assayed as high as \$1,000 per ton. Having spoken of the Incorporation Bill I would like to show the arbitrary manner in which the Senate acted in this instance in their refusal of our demand. It is enough to state that parties went twice to Ottawa, assisted by lawyers, to oppose the incorporation. See their inconsistency. In Montreal they sue the Company for not being incorporated; in Ottawa they fight against its incorporation. They failed to kill the Bill before the Commons, succeeded by misrepresentations to entice certain Senators, whose conduct is as unjust as it is inexplicable. They even refused Senators Bellerose and Trudel one day's grace to disprove these misrepresentations, to say the least. Luckily, Mr. Editor we have a Local House which can grant us an Act of Incorporation.

To prove my allegations, I herewith produce the debates which have taken place in the Senate, hoping that I will not trespass too much on your space, as I wish to show how arbitrary was the conduct of the Senators in this instance.

At all events, the public know, or could ascertain by very little enquiry, as it was a common fact on the street, that the property, or the mine, was not developed. Everybody knew that they would be buying stock in a Company, and no one can say that any dividend was promised to them at any specified time. How is it that to-day we should meet people, so unreasonable, to complain of a stock that they bought with their eyes open? Surely, no grounds whatever. In the meantime I may say that it is the intention of the principal stockholders to visit the property soon and take the proper means to work it, and I must say that we entertain strong hopes to do so this summer, as the North-Western Railway is likely to continue its road to Deadwood this summer, more especially

if all the shareholders show a little common sense; and help, rather than hamper operations by legal quibbles.

Your truly obedient servant,

P. A. A. DORION,
President of the Company.

Montreal, April 2, 1881.

THE SILVER PLUME MINING COEPANY.

To the Editor of the MONTREAL HERALD.

SIR,—Being one of the parties now before the Courts seeking redress against Mr. Dorion and his associates in this matter, I may be permitted to answer his letter published in your issue of this morning. Mr. Justice Torrance held that Mr. Dorion and his co-defendants have acted as illegally as if they were incorporated, when they were not. His reasons were, among others, that in its Constitution and By-laws the Company is called a Corporation, and that it has used a corporate seal. From a judgment, which turns so entirely upon a question of law, Mr. Dorion and his friends have appealed, as they had a perfect right to do; but it is the height of impropriety and presumption on the part of Mr. Dorion, a member of the Bar, before the Court of Appeals has passed judgment on his appeal, to rush into print and attack the judgment not only as illegal, but as unjust, while professing the highest respect for the learned Judge.

His attack upon the Senate, whose decision Mr. Dorion says he is to get the Legislature of Quebec to reverse, is in no better taste. The Senate being called upon for an Act of incorporation, refused to grant one, among other reasons, because the conduct of the parties seeking incorporation in connection with the Company was being attacked as fraudulent and the matter was being investigated by the Courts, and also because, while the preamble

recited that the Company was organized with a paid-up capital of \$1,000,000, it was distinctly admitted before the Senate Committee that the pretended paid-up capital was represented solely by some undeveloped mining lot in Dakota Territory of the United States, for nine-tenths of which Mr. Dorion and Mr. Bickerdike, three weeks before the organization of the Company, gave \$15,000 to Mr. Matheney, who for his tenth was to get one-tenth of the stock of the Company. The facts had to be admitted, since the deeds disclosing them were filed in the notarial offices of Mr. Hart and Mr. Doucet, bearing dates of March and April last, and Mr. Dorion and Mr. Doucet under oath have confessed to them. When Mr. Dorion has succeeded in getting the Québec Legislature to reverse the decision of the Senate, it will be time enough to impute dishonourable motives to "certain Senators."

With regard to the question of fraud, it is still under investigation—in fact new investigations have already sprung up in consequence of a "little difficulty" among Mr. Dorion's own friends and *collaborateurs*, and in all probability the end is not yet. An impartial public, therefore, will soon have all the necessary material for forming a judgment, without any assistance from so disinterested a guide as Mr. Dorion.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

WM. F. LIGHTHALL.

Montreal, April 8th, 1881.

THE SILVER PLUME MINING COMPANY.

To the Editor of the MONTREAL HERALD.

SIR,—I appeal to your courtesy and request the use of your columns a second time in reply to Mr. Lighthall, who has in your issue of yesterday commented upon the explanations I gave in the preceding one.

I am happy that Mr. Lighthall has unmasked himself and makes himself out as the injured party, who has to complain of alleged frauds on the part of the Company. We shall, if you please, examine the behaviour of this professional gentleman towards our Company, -he, the victim of misplaced confidence.

Now, Mr. Lighthall, you attack the Company and vilify it in your evidence under oath, stating that you purchased shares of this Company in the firm belief that it was incorporated, and that without such firm belief you would not have done so, and, moreover, accuse the Company of having made false statements.

Allow me, Mr. Lighthall, to ask you before the public, since you are our principal accuser, by what right you attack the officers of this Company, you who never have had any business dealings with any officers of this Company in any shape or manner? You begin your attack by threatening to oppose and cause our application for a Bill of incorporation to be thrown aside if we do not pay you; and following up your threats you make a sworn statement declaring that you have bought shares in this Company, believing it to be incorporated, when it is not so. When two witnesses emphatically declare that you, Mr. Lighthall, before purchasing any stock, called upon the Secretary of the Company to ascertain its organization, and that then and there it was told and explained to you how the Company had been organized, and that it was not incorporated, but that it was the intention to have it incorporated at the next session of Parliament.

And what is your subsequent answer to that?

Simply, that you do not remember. A weak answer surely to such a grave charge as that you make. And is it to be imagined that you, who are so punctilious, would purchase shares of a company without taking the trouble of inquiring about its organization and its standing, the more so when the Company is just formed; and if you did so, would you have the shadow of an excuse, suppos-

ing your purchase did not turn out as profitable as you expected, when you declare under oath that you purchased the shares for the purpose of selling them at a high figure? I defy you to bring forth a single fact which can justify your attacks against this Company or any of its officers. If you have any quarrels to settle with those who sold you the stock, you are not justifiable in calling the officers of the Company to account for them—the more so when you exchanged for those shares mortgaged property, and obtained for them a high figure.

In reply to your remarks on the judgment rendered, I have not in my letter said anything reflecting in any way on the Court; simply, that I hoped the judgment would be reversed. This remark is quite natural, since the case is in appeal.

As to the Senators, I did not say the half of what I wanted to. These gentlemen did not scruple to accuse us of fraud, and that simple on the strength of Mr. Lighthall's assertions. And some of these gentlemen—I refer to the Honourable Messrs. Vidal, Campbell and Bottsford were compelled to amend their report in the open Senate, and acknowledge, peremptorily, the falseness of their accusation, and admit that they had no grounds for the rashness of their remarks. But this admission they made only on the representations of the Hon. Messrs. Bellerose, Trudel and Miller, and we sincerely thank the latter for the manliness they displayed on this occasion.

Why, Mr. Editor, do these Honourable Senators espouse the cause of Mr. Lighthall? Surely not on constitutional grounds. The Bill was a private one, which had been fully heard, discussed and commented upon in the House of Commons, and passed by it after having gone through all its readings.

I cannot account for it otherwise than by the remark made by Mr. Lighthall, before leaving for Ottawa, that he knew of a certain Senator, a friend of his, in Montreal, who

he could induce to have the Bill thrown out from the Senate.

This Honourable Senator may now reflect on the injustice of his course. Surely the Senators who opposed the Bill could not have been serious in given as their reason for doing so, that the mining property, which represented the capital, had not been purchased at a sufficiently high figure.

The mining property of the Homestake, capitalised at \$10,000,000, had been purchased a short time before for a few thousand dollars. These are daily occurrences. However, this was purely a question affecting the shareholders, and a subterfuge on the part of those Senators, as ample proof and documentary evidence were offered to them, establishing the immense prospects and returns of the property if they would postpone their decision till the following day.

As to the last portion of Mr Lighthall's letter, I protest against his false allegations. If certain parties, strangers to the Company, have dirty linen to wash, they may do so as they think proper. The officers of the Company are in no way concerned with their sayings or doings.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

P. A. A. DORION,

President of the Company.

Montreal, April 9, 1881.

THE SILVER PLUME MINING COMPANY.

To the Editor of the MONTREAL HERALD.

SIR,—In answer to Mr, Dorion's frantic appeals to me in your issue of this morning, published as an *advertisement*, I can only say that my accusations against Mr.

Dorion and his friends have been made in judicial proceedings now pending, and Mr. Dorion, himself a lawyer, should have been content to let the courts decide. He rushed into print instead, regardless of expense, and ~~insulted~~ ~~both~~ the ~~parliament~~, so far rendered, and the Senate,—and some notice of his effusion was called for. But it is manifestly waste of time to further discuss the matter, at this stage, in the newspapers with one who feigns not to perceive the false position he occupies and accuses others of dishonest conduct, instead of quietly waiting until the courts have vindicated his character, if he is innocent.

As to the washing of ditty linen, however, to which Mr. Dorion alludes, I must correct him. The dispute now under investigation, in the Police court, is not between strangers to the Company, but between its Vice-President and one of its principal members up to a recent date, and Mr. Dorion will be lucky if he can escape being disagreeably mixed up with one or both. While I deny Mr. Dorion's assertions regarding myself, I add, any person who knows both of our characters will at once appreciate each of our statements at their true value.

This ends my newspaper correspondence as far as Silver Plume is concerned,

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

WM. F. LIGHTHALL.

Montreal, April 12, 1881.